



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/911,592

07/24/2001

Ralph S. Hoefelmeyer

COS00019

3657

25537 7590 01/12/2011

VERIZON  
PATENT MANAGEMENT GROUP  
1320 North Court House Road  
9th Floor  
ARLINGTON, VA 22201-2909

EXAMINER

CHEN, SHIN HON

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2431

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/12/2011

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patents@verizon.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES

---

*Ex parte* RALPH S. HOEFELMEYER and THERESA S. PHILLIPS

---

Appeal 2009-005828  
Application 09/911,592<sup>1</sup>  
Technology Center 2400

---

*Before* JOSEPH L. DIXON, JAY P. LUCAS, and STEPHEN C. SIU,  
*Administrative Patent Judges.*

LUCAS, *Administrative Patent Judge.*

DECISION ON APPEAL<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Application filed July 24, 2001. The real party in interest is Verizon Corporation.

<sup>2</sup> The two-month time period for filing an appeal or commencing a civil action, as recited in 37 C.F.R. § 1.304, or for filing a request for rehearing, as recited in 37 C.F.R. § 41.52, begins to run from the “MAIL DATE” (paper delivery mode) or the “NOTIFICATION DATE” (electronic delivery mode) shown on the PTOL-90A cover letter attached to this decision.

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Appellants appeal from a final rejection of claims 1 to 15 under authority of 35 U.S.C. § 134(a). The Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences (BPAI) has jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

We affirm the rejections.

Appellants' invention relates to a computer virus-scanning system for efficiently scanning e-mail for malicious code arriving at a plurality of intranets (claim 1). In the words of Appellants:

[The] invention [provides] a scalable layered, network security architecture that comprises a combination of server-based and client-based anti-virus scanning components in conjunction with a firewall for diverting suspect traffic to decoy servers. This network security architecture can be deployed between the organization's intranet and the internet backbone and can be shared between various organizations, thereby providing the economies of scale that conventional network security solutions lack.

(Spec. 3, ¶ [04]).

The following claim illustrates the claims on appeal:

Claim 1:

1. A network security system to be deployed between a plurality of intranets belonging to

respective organizations and an internet backbone,  
comprising:

a scanning system coupled to the intranets  
for scanning incoming electronic mail for  
malicious code;

an anti-virus server coupled to the intranets  
for downloading anti-virus code to clients coupled  
to the intranets; and

a switch coupled between the internet  
backbone, the scanning system, and the anti-virus  
server, said switch configured for:

directing incoming electronic mail from the  
internet backbone to the scanning system.

The prior art relied upon by the Examiner in rejecting the claims on  
appeal is:

Hypponen	US 2003/0191957 A1	Oct. 9, 2003 (Feb. 19, 1999)
----------	--------------------	---------------------------------

Yanovsky	US 7,010,807 B1	Mar. 7, 2006 (Apr. 13, 2001)
----------	-----------------	---------------------------------

*Network Associates Ships CyberCop Sting-Industry's First 'Decoy'  
Server Silently Traces and Tracks Hacker Activity* (1999), available at [http://  
www.prnewswire.com/cgi-  
bin/stories.pl?ACCT=104&STORY=/www/story/07-141999](http://www.prnewswire.com/cgi-bin/stories.pl?ACCT=104&STORY=/www/story/07-141999).

## REJECTIONS

The Examiner rejects the claims as follows:

R1: Claims 1, 3, 5, 8, and 10 stand provisionally rejected for obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1, 4, 7, 11, and 14 of co-pending Application No. 10/024,202.

R2: Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, and 10 to 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for being obvious over Hypponen in view of Yanovsky.

R3: Claims 2, 4, 7, and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for being obvious over Hypponen in view of Yanovsky further in view of NAI.

We have only considered those arguments that Appellants actually raised in the Briefs. Arguments Appellants could have made but chose not to make in the Briefs have not been considered and are deemed to be waived. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(vii).

## ISSUES

The issues involve whether Appellants have shown that the Examiner erred in rejecting the claims under obviousness-type double patenting and under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). The issue under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) turns on whether Hypponen and Yanovsky render obvious Appellants' claimed "system to be deployed between a plurality of intranets" (claim 1). More specifically, the issue is whether the Examiner's finding of a single intranet in the prior art meets Appellants' claim limitation.

## FINDINGS OF FACT

The record supports the following findings of fact (FF) by a preponderance of the evidence.

### *Disclosure*

1. Appellants have invented a network security scanning system to be deployed between a plurality of intranets (claim 1). The system's purpose is to scan e-mail for malicious code (*id.*). Appellants disclose that an advantage of the claimed invention is achieving economies of scale by having one scanning system protecting multiple organizations (Spec. 3, ¶ [04]).

### *Co-pending Application No. 10/024,202*

2. Appellants' co-pending patent application has not resulted in the issuance of a patent as of the mailing of this final decision.

### *Hypponen*

3. The Hypponen reference discloses a network security scanning system for a TCP/IP network (¶¶ [0011] to [0013], [0034]). The system's purpose is to scan data traffic for viruses (¶ [0011]).

## PRINCIPLE OF LAW

Appellants have the burden on appeal to the Board to demonstrate Examiner error. *See In re Kahn*, 441 F.3d 977, 985-86 (Fed. Cir. 2006).

## ANALYSIS

*Arguments with respect to the  
obviousness-type double patenting rejection  
of claims 1, 3, 5, 8, and 10 [R1]*

The Examiner rejected the noted claims as being obvious over claims in the co-pending application, Examiner's Answer pages 3 to 4.

Since neither the application before us nor the co-pending application have resulted in the issuance of a patent (FF#2), we do not treat Appellants' arguments concerning the obviousness-type double patenting issue (App. Br. 10, top to 11, middle). We rely upon the CAFC's recent ruling in *Sun Pharmaceutical Industries, Ltd., v. Eli Lilly and Company*, Case No. 2010-1105 \*15, July 28, 2010, for guidance: "[T]he double patenting doctrine is concerned with the issued patent and the invention disclosed in that issued patent, not earlier drafts of the patent disclosure and claims."

In this case, no patent has issued for either the present or co-pending application. In view of *Sun Pharmaceutical*, we do not address the Examiner's rejection under non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting.

*Arguments with respect to the rejection  
of claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, and 10 to 15  
under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) [R2]*

The Examiner has rejected the noted claims for being obvious over Hypponen and Yanovsky, Examiner's Answer pages 4 to 7.

Appellants argue that each claim requires a “plurality of intranets,” whereas the Hypponen reference merely discloses a single computer data network 1 (App. Br. 12, middle).

“[M]ere duplication of parts has no patentable significance unless a new and unexpected result is produced.” *See In re Harza*, 274 F.2d 669, 671 (CCPA 1960) (The claims recited a plurality of “ribs” for water sealing a container, whereas the prior art disclosed a single, flexible water stop for preventing water passage. Although the reference disclosed just one seal, and not the plurality of “ribs,” the court held that duplicative parts have patentable significance only if the parts produce a new and unexpected result.).

We agree with the Examiner. We find that Appellants have invented a network security scanning system to be deployed between a plurality of intranets (FF#1). We find that the system’s purpose is to scan e-mail for malicious code (*id.*). Appellants disclose that an advantage of the claimed invention is achieving economies of scale by having one scanning system that protects multiple organizations (*id.*). In comparison, the Hypponen reference discloses a network security scanning system for a TCP/IP network (FF#2). Hypponen’s system scans data traffic for viruses (*id.*).

In this case, the claimed invention differs from the Hypponen reference only insofar as a “plurality of intranets” is recited in claim 1. We find the “plurality of intranets” to be merely a duplication of one part (*i.e.*, an intranet), since Appellants disclose that the purpose of the plurality of



intranets (versus a single intranet) is to create economies of scale (FF#1). In accordance with *Harza*'s teachings and the above-stated analysis, we find that Appellants failed to demonstrate error in the Examiner's rejection R2. Accordingly, we affirm.

*Arguments with respect to the rejection  
of claims 2, 4, 7, and 9  
under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) [R3]*

The Examiner has rejected the noted claims for being obvious over Hypponen, Yanovsky, and NAI, Examiner's Answer pages 7 to 8.

With respect to claims 2, 4, 7, and 9, Appellants make a similar argument as stated above regarding the claimed "plurality of intranets." (App. Br. 8, middle to 9, top). Since we already addressed this argument (*see* discussion of R2, *supra*), we need not re-address it here. We thus affirm the rejection R3.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

Based on the findings of facts and analysis above, we conclude that Appellants have not shown that the Examiner erred in rejecting claims 1 to 15.

DECISION

We affirm the Examiner's rejections [R1 and R2] of claims 1 to 15.

Appeal 2009-005828  
Application 09/911,592

No time period for taking any subsequent action in connection with this appeal may be extended under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(1)(iv).

AFFIRMED

rwk

VERIZON  
PATENT MANAGEMENT GROUP  
1320 North Court House Road  
9th Floor  
ARLINGTON, VA 22201-2909